REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1-25 are rejected undid 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gehman et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,553, here thatter "Gehman").

As to claim 1, the Examiner states:

"As to claim 1, Gehman teaches a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by a girnt device to a server,"

Applicant respectfully disagress. Gehman is for processing inside a personal computer and this is shown in Gehrald FIGs. 2 and 3 which show the client 200 (a personal computer) and the serial bus adapter \$19/300 (inside the personal computer), which contains the transmit and receive FIFOs 310 and 312. This is explained in Gehman col. 2, line 56, through col. 3, line 54:

"With reference now FIG. 2, a block diagram of a data processing

system in which the present invention may be implemented is illustrated. <u>Data processing system 200 is an example of a client computer.</u>

An operating system may be a commercially available operating. in FIG. 2. The operating system may be a commercially available operating

system such as NT Windows of OS/2. ...

Turning now to FIG. 3. Serial bus adapter 300...includes a number of components used to provide in interface between PCI local bus 302 and a 1394 serial bus 304. Serial bus adapter in the depicted example may be serial bus adapter 219 from FIG. 2. Serial bus adapter 300 includes a physical layer device 306, a link 308, a transmit FIFO unit 310, a receive FIFO unit 312, a DMA engine 314, and a host interface 316." [underlining and deletions for clarity] clarity]

Applicant respectfully traveles the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination, as exemplified in claim includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"A network interface for prodesting incoming messages sent by a client device to a server, comprising

a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and in assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form!

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 1, Gehrian teaches a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by a client device to a server, comprising:

a First-In-First-Out (AFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. [4] lines 11-25);" [underlining for clarity]

Applicant respectfully disagress. As explained in Gehman col. 2, line 56, through col. 3, line 54, cited above, Gehman teaches how signals are processed within a client device not how signals from a client device to a server are processed. It is respectfully submitted that the nature of the messages in Gehman it different; e.g., PCI local bus to 1394 signals versus serial to parallel Hypertext Transfer Projectol messages.

The Examiner continues:

"[As to claim 1, Gentlem teaches a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by a client device to a server, comprising:]

a regular-expression battern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression battern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message headers to the server (col. 1, lines 13-24, 25, 1, lines 39-47)." [insertion and deletion for clarity]

Applicant respectfully disagrass. Gehman does not describe a "regular-expression pattern matching circuit" or recognizing "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers" in Gehman col. 1, lines 13-14 which states:

"...The packet includes a header and a payload. The header includes information identifying the target, payload type, source, and various control data as specified by the protecol while the payload holds the data that is transmitted. When a packet is received at a data processing system, the packet is parsed to see if the packet intended for the data processing system."

Gehman also does not describe a "regular-expression pattern matching circuit" or recognizing "Hypertext Transfer Propocol (HTTP) message headers" in Gehman col. 1, lines 39-47, which states:

"Currently, on a data processing system using the 1394 standard, a link, providing the interface to the 1394 serial bus, must parse a received packet to determine whether to accept the packet and whether to acknowledge acceptance of a packet. If the packet is accepted, the link places the packet into

a buffer configured as a first-in first-out (FIFO) buffer. On the other side of the FIFO buffer in the data processing system is a DMA engine that removes the packet and parses the packet in a manner similar to the link."

Gehman also teaches away from the above by indicating the problems with the above and that an improved system is designable by referring to the above and stating in the last paragraph of Gehman at col. 1, lines 48-51:

"This mechanism results in redundant functions and circuitry. Therefore, it would be adjuntageous to have an improved method and apparatus for receiving packets on a data processing system."

Further, with regard to claim! it is respectfully submitted that Gehman does not disclose a combination that includes the claimed limitation of:

"...the regular-expression partern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message headers to the server."

As seen in Gehman col. 1, like 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47, cited by the Examiner and quoted above, there is no mention in the concurrent operations claimed. This has the advantages described in Specification page 7, line 30, through page 8, line 4:

"The present invention allows regular-expression pattern matching to be performed concurrently with the serial-to-parallel message-component assembly, such that message protocol header analysis can be done while incoming data is being clocked into the FIFO buffer 104. In this way, the message protocol header analysis incurs no extra time delay, and a compact representation of the extracted message protocol header information is ready for transfer to the web server 26 at the same time as the ordinary, assembled parts of the message. This technique may be referred to as "latency hiding"; i.e., overlapping some parts of a series of information processing steps in order to reduce the sequence's overall delay."

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because:

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." [emphasis addred] Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co. (730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984)(citing Connell v. Sears Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed Dir. 1983)))

As to claim 2, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 2, Gehiern teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 further including: a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 3, lines 12-15)."

Applicant respectfully disagress because no logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further claimfred function is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2) since no logic circuit having the claimfred functions is described in Gehman col. 1, lines 55-63, which states:

"The present inventical provides a method and apparatus for receiving packets from a bus. A packet is received at an interface to the bus. The packet is parsed, and a determination is made whether to retain the packet from the parsing of the packet. The packet is placed in a buffer with a header. The packet is moved from the taffer to another bus using information located within the header, wherein repeated parsing of the packet to move the packet to another bus is unnecessary."

Similarly, Gehman col. 2, line 43-55, states:

"In the depicted example, a server 104 is connected to network 102 along with storage unit 106 In addition, clients 108, 110, and 112 also are connected to a network 102. These clients 108, 110, and 112 maybe, for example, personal computers or network computers. For purposes of this application, a network computer is any computer, coupled to a network, which receives a program or other application from another computer coupled to the network. In the depicted example, server 104 provides data, such as boot files, operating system images, and applications to clients 108-112. Clients 108, 110, and 112 are clients to server 104. Distributed data processing system 100 may include additional servers clients, and other devices not shown.

Similarly, Gehman col. 3, line 2-15, states:

"The LAN may be implemented as a serial bus architecture in the depicted example. In such a case, the processes of the present invention may be implemented in LAN adapter 210."

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.

As to claim 3, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the server the parse TTP message headers in a compact form."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 3, Gehnan teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein: the regular expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the saver the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form (col. 1, lines 13 24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be extent upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.

As to claim 4, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression patters matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 4, Gehran teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein: the regular expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.

As to claim 5, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 5, Gehard teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein: the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof (col. 1, lines 39-48)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees because no regular-expression matching circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be examiner upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.

As to claim 6, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies."

The Examiner states:

> "As to claim 6, Gehring teaches the network interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein: the HTTP pressage headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24)."

Applicant respectfully disagness because no HTTP message headers or HTTP cookies are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). Pre-relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be element upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipal by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Ch., supra.

As to claim 7, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitations not disclosed as in claim 1 and the additional limitations not disclosed in Gehman

"the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies, and the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination

thereoft and
a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to
provide a response message to the client device based on a content of
the recognized HTTP hassage header."

The Examiner states:

- ""As to claim 7, German teaches a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by a lient device to a server, comprising:

 a First-In-First-Out (IFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. lines 11-25);

 a regular-expression mattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, provide the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form to the server, and provide to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47), wherein:

 the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24), and

and

> the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereof (col.1, lines 39-48); and

> a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message hapter (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 3, lines 12-15). 11.""

Applicant respectfully disagraph for the same reasons as in claim 1 and because no HTTP cookies, regular-expression matching circuit, or claimed logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehn Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is resectfully submitted that claim 7 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipality by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 11., supra.

As to claim 8, Applicant reliectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitations not disclosed in Gehman of:

"a central processing unit (CNU);

- a bus connected to the CPU; a memory connected to the line, the memory having a server application program stored therein; and
- a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:

 a First-In-First-Out (FFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form,
- a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the impuning messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies." HTTP message header include HTTP cookies."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 8, Gehman teaches a server for providing services to a client device, comprising:

a central processing unit (CPU) (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55);

- a bus connected to the CPU (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55);
 a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored therein (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55); and
 a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:
 a First-In-First-Out (FO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. Lines 11-25), and
 a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer potocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, pars recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and privide the parsed HTTP message headers to the CPU and the memory, where the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47, (col. 1, lines 13-24))."

Applicant respectfully disagrass As explained, Gehman discloses a section of a client device rather than a server as claimed so the individual components are not connected as claimed and elements are missing as explained above. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed element or the element connected as described will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is remetifully submitted that claim 8 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick J., supra.

As to claim 9, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response making to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 9, Gentian teaches the server as claimed in claim 8 further including: a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 3, lines 12-15)."

Applicant respectfully disagress because no logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further districation is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is requested since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 100., supra.

As to claim 10, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the remove the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 10, Gentian teaches the server as claimed in claim 8 wherein: the regular-express in pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the first mory the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form (col. 1, lines 15, 24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disables because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examination cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.1 (c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.

As to claim 11, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the innemory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 11, Gentlan teaches the server as claimed in claim 8 wherein:

the regular-expression rattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagres because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examinal cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.16 (c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick S., supra.

As to claim 12. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicant's claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the HTTP message headers include HTTP cookies."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 12, German teaches the server as claimed in claim 8 wherein:

the HTTP message histers include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24)."

Applicant respectfully disagress because no HTTP message headers or HTTP cookies are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be design upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 32., supra.

As to claim 13, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitations not disclosed as in claim 1 and the additional limitations not disclosed in Gehman

- a central processing unit (CPIII)
- a bus connected to the CPU;
- a memory connected to the six, the memory having a server application program stored therein; and
- a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:

 a First-In-First-Out (* 170) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages
 - a First-In-First-Out (FFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, a regular-expression return matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize H. Seriet Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in selincoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message headers into recognized HTTP message headers, provide the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory, and provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit, wherein
- provide to the TPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit, wherein: the HTTP messige headers include HTTP cookies, and the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is implemented by a technic consisting of hardware, software, and a combination thereograph a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP misssage headers."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 13, Gelipian teaches a server for providing services to a client device, comprising:

- client device, comprising:

 a central processing up (CPU) (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55);

 a bus connected to the PU (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55);

 a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored the client (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55); and

 a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:

 a First-In-First-Out (PO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble to incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. lines 11-25),

 a regular-expression putern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parallel cognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers, parallel to a parallel form, recognized headers, parallel to a parallel form, recognized headers, parallel form, parsed HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers in a

> compact form to the CPU and the memory, and provide to the CPU and the memory incoming message that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47), wherein:

the HTTP message is a ders include HTTP cookies, and the regular-expression pattern matching input is implemented by a technique consisting of hardware, software, and a sumbination thereof (col. 1, lines 39-48), and a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message is the client device based on a content of the recognized is the client device based on a content of the recognized is the client device based on a content of the rec 3, lines 12-15). 17."

Applicant respectfully disagrams for the same reasons as in claim 1 and because no regular-expression matching circuit is claimed logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further carrierous is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman ard tot quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is resultfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 13., supra.

As to claim 14, Applicant refrictfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitations not disclosed in Gehman of:

"a client device; and

- a server connected to the climit device for providing services to the client device, the server including:
 - a central processing unit (CPU), a bus connected to the CPU,

 - a memory connected the bus, the memory having a server application
- a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program store in erein, and a network interface for cocessing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, is network interface including:

 a FIFO buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, and a regular-expression pattern is ching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression pattern is ching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the introducing messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages, parse recognized HTTP message

headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and provide the parsed HTTP message header to the CPU and the memory."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 14, theman teaches a communications network, comprising:

comprising:

a client device (Fig. 1 to 1. 2, lines 43-55);
and a server connected to the client device for providing services to the client device (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55), the server including:
a central processing to (CPU) (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55),
a bus connected to the PU (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55),
a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored to the server (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55), the network interface is cluding:

a FIFO buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming mess to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the incoming mess to receive the incoming messages and to a regular-expression thereof matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the regular-expression that matching circuit adapted to, concurrent with the assembly of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transference of the passage headers into parsed HTTP message headers, and to vide the parsed HTTP message headers to the CPU and the memory (col. 1 the standard recognized and to the lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagraph for the same reasons as in claim 1 and because the relationship between the server and client device is mot mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections of Gehman are no duoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case or claim 2.

Based on the above, it is resultfully submitted that claim 14 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipal by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 1d., supr.

As to claim 15, Applicant registicifully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response making to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP in sage headers."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 15, German teaches the communications network as claimed in claim 14 further it inding:

a logic circuit connected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message in the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message have response (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col. 2 lines 12 15)" 3, lines 12-15)."

Applicant respectfully disagned because no logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further defication is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be The relevant section of Gehman is evident upon inspection as is the case or claim 2.

Based on the above, it is resectfully submitted that claim 15 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 🌺., supra.

As to claim 16, Applicant rejectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the li ation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression patter imatching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the company the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 16, Chiman teaches the communications network as

claimed in claim 14 wherein the regular-expression attern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the temory the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form (col. 1, lines 1, 24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disa s because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examinal cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.1 (2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed elemental ill be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is resistfully submitted that claim 16 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick ., supra.

Based on the above, it is restatfully submitted that claim 25 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipass by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., supra.

As to claim 17, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 17, Gaman teaches the communications network as claimed in claim 14 wherein."

the regular-expression pattern matching circuit is further adapted to provide to the CPU and transmemory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagres because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examines cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.1 (c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed elements will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 13., supra.

As to claim 18, Applicant rejectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the HTTP message headers ude HTTP cookies."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 18, Comman teaches the communications network as claimed in claim 14 wherein the HTTP message to the HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24)."

Applicant respectfully disagram because no HTTP message headers or HTTP cookies are mentioned in the Examiner cited ections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be the entern upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is resistfully submitted that claim 18 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipal by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Lo., supra.

As to claim 19, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the literations not disclosed as in claim 1 and the additional limitations not disclosed in Gehman

- a client device; and
- a server connected to the client device for providing services to the client device, the server including:

 - server including:
 a central processing up (CPU),
 a bus connected to the PU,
 a memory connected to the purious description program store acrein, and
 a network interface for processing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, and the network interface including:
 a First-In-Fir put (FIFO) buffer adapted to receive the incoming message and to assemble the incoming messages from a serial to a particle form,
 a regular-expression pattern matching circuit connected to the FIFO buffer protocoment in the assembly of the incoming messages from a rial to a parallel form, recognize Hypertext Transfer Protocoment in the parallel form, recognized HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers into parsed HTTP message headers into parsed headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory, and provided to the CPU and the memory incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit, wherein:
 the HT message headers include HTTP cookies, and the resultance thereof and a problem to the consisting of hardware, software, and a problem to the consisting of hardware, software, and a problem thereof and

 - a logic circuit is implemented a logic circuit is implemented a logic circuit is implemented a logic circuit is innected to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provid a response message to the client device based on a content in the recognized HTTP message headers."

The Examiner states:

comprising:

a client device (Fig. 1151. 2, lines 43-55); and a server connected to the client device for providing services to the client device, the server including:

col. 2, lines 43-55),

wherein:

and

lines 39-48), and

3, lines 12-15). 23."

HTTP cookies regular-expression n element will be evident upon inspec

GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick ..., supra.

"As to claim 19, the hman teaches a communications network

a central processing (CPU), a bus connected to the CPU (Fig. 1,

col. 2, lines 43-55),

a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server application program stored the in (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55), and

a network interface for coessing incoming messages sent by the client device to the server, the network interface including:

a First-In-First-Out interface including:

a First-In-First-Out interface including:

O) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages and to assemble the form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 1, lines 39-47), wherein:

a memory connected to the bus, the memory having a server in (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 43-55), and occasing incoming messages sent by the client interface including:

O) buffer adapted to receive the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel lines 11-25), attern matching circuit adapted to, concurrent ing messages from a serial to a parallel form, otocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in ecognized HTTP message headers into parsed the memory incoming message headers in a compact form to the CPU at the memory, and provide to the CPU and the memory incoming message headers in a compact form to the CPU at the memory, and provide to the CPU and the memory incoming message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory incoming message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory incoming message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory incoming message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory incoming message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory incoming message headers in a compact form to the CPU and the memory incoming message headers.

the HTTP message has rs include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24),

the regular-expression attern matching circuit is implemented by a technique consisting of hard the, software, and a combination thereof (col.1,

a logic circuit connect to the FIFO buffer, the logic circuit adapted to provide a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message haders (col. 1, lines 55-63, col. 2, lines 43-55, col.

Applicant respectfully disagers for the same reasons as in claim 1 and because no hing circuit or claimed logic circuit is mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehn Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant sections Gehman are not quoted since the lack of the claimed as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is residutfully submitted that claim 19 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipally by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik

As to claim 20, Applicant resectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"receiving the incoming messages using a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer; assembling the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form using the FIFO buffer: and

concurrent with the assemble of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel

recognizing Hypertex transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incomis messages received by the FIFO buffer using a regular-expression path matching circuit, parsing recognized H. P message headers into parsed HTTP message headers using the regular expression pattern matching circuit, and providing the parsed HTTP residence to the server."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 20, Ge than teaches a method for processing incoming messages sent by a client devel to a server, comprising:

receiving the income messages using a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer; assembling the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel form using the FIFO buffer (col. 1 tipes 39-47, col. 4, lines 11-25); and concurrent with the a simbling of the incoming messages from a serial

to a parallel form:

recognizing Hyperte Transfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming ressages received by the FIFO buffer using a regular-expression pattern nutrining circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47).

parsing recognized H P message headers into parsed HTTP message headers using the regular-extension pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47), and

providing the parsed TP message headers to the server (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disastes because the concurrent, recognizing, parsing, or providing steps are not mentioned the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the diffined element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

14

Based on the above, it is resentfully submitted that claim 20 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 2., supra.

As to claim 21, Applicant resectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"providing a response message to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 21, Get in teaches the method as claimed in claim 20 further including:

providing a response sage to the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagned because no "recognized HTTP message headers" are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be easient upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is restatfully submitted that claim 21 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick ... supra.

As to claim 22, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the providing the parsed H TP message headers to the server provides the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 22, Getten teaches the method as claimed in claim 20 wherein:

the providing the part of HTTP message headers to the server provides the parsed HTTP message headers in a compact form (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disages because no "parsed HTTP message headers" are mentioned in the Examiner cited dispursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be determined the control of the claimed element will be determined to the control of the

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 11., supra.

As to claim 23, Applicant rejectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limitation not disclosed in Gehman of:

"providing to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pages matching circuit."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 23, Get in teaches the method as claimed in claim 20 further including:

providing to the serve incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression pattern matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disases s because no regular-expression pattern matching circuit is mentioned in the Examination cited sections of Gehman. Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.1 (c)(2). The relevant section of Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed elemenativill be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is reconstitully submitted that claim 23 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipate by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 12., supra.

As to claim 24, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the limition not disclosed in Gehman of:

"the HTTP message headers and HTTP cookies."

The Examiner states:

> "As to claim 24, Gelian teaches the method as claimed in claim 20 wherein:

> the HTTP message there include HTTP cookies (col. 1, lines 13-24)."

Applicant respectfully disagres because no HTTP cookies are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehmar Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR \$1.104(c)(2). The relevant section Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspection as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is resultfully submitted that claim 24 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipally by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick 11, supra.

As to claim 25, Applicant resectfully traverses the rejections since the Applicants' claimed combination includes the line attion not disclosed in Gehman of:

"receiving the incoming messes using a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer; assembling the incoming messes from a serial to a parallel form using the FIFO buffer:

concurrent with the assemble of the incoming messages from a serial to a parallel

recognizing Hypertee gransfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming messages received by the FIFO buffer using a regular-expression page in matching circuit, parsing recognized H pressage headers into parsed HTTP message headers using the regular expression pattern matching circuit, and providing the parsed and P message headers to the server in a compact form.

providing the parsed of TP message headers to the server in a compact form; providing a response message if the client device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message header and providing to the server incoming messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression page in matching circuit."

The Examiner states:

"As to claim 25, Ge than a [sic] teaches the method for processing incoming messages sent by a cent device to a server, comprising:

receiving the income messages using a First-In-First-Out (FIFO) buffer (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 1, lines 11-25);

assembling the income messages from a serial to a parallel form using the FIFO buffer (col. 1 messages from a serial to a parallel form (col. 1, lines 39-47, col. 1, lines 39-47),

recognizing Hyperter fransfer Protocol (HTTP) message headers embedded in the incoming assages received by the FIFO buffer using a

> regular-expression pattern nathing circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47).

> parsing recognized H P message headers into parsed HTTP message headers using the regular-expression pattern matching circuit, and providing the parsed HTTP message headers to the server in a compact form; providing a response message to the click device based on a content of the recognized HTTP message headers (col. nes 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47); and providing to the server in matching messages that cannot be recognized by the regular-expression page on matching circuit (col. 1, lines 13-24, col. 1, lines 39-47)."

lines 39-47)."

Applicant respectfully disagram because no HTTP message headers are mentioned in the Examiner cited sections of Gehn Further clarification is requested pursuant to 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). The relevant section Gehman is not quoted since the lack of the claimed element will be evident upon inspect as is the case for claim 2.

Based on the above, it is resistably submitted that claim 25 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as not being anticipally by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick ., supra.

The other references cited by Examiner showing the prior art have been considered and are not believed to disclose, th, or suggest, either singularly or in combination, Applicants' invention as claimed.

Based on the above, it is resultfully submitted that claims 1-25 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as not beit anticipated by Gehman because of Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. America bist & Derrick Co., supra.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is sumitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the rejections is pectfully requested. Allowance of claims 1-25 at an early date is solicited.

To the extent necessary, a position for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any stage in fees due in connection with the filing of this

paper, including any extension of the fees, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

William D. Zahrt II

Registration No. 26,070

The Law Offices of Mikio Ishimaru 1110 Sunnyvale-Saratoga Rd., Suite Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Telephone: (408) 738-0592 Fax: (408) 738-0881

June 24, 2005

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

BLACK BORDERS

1

☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
OTHER.

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.